

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/627,599	FINK, STEVEN T.
	Examiner Enoch E Peavey	Art Unit 3676

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Enoch E Peavey. (3) _____
 (2) Ed Garlepp, Reg. No. 45,330. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 01 September 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 & 13 specifically, claims 1-22 are pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Patent Nos. 5,639,100; 6,123,337; 5,090,871.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Representative suggested amending claim 13 to include a semi-conductor processing unit, Examiner agrees that such an amendment will make the claims of the instant application patentably distinguishable from the prior art of record. Applicant's Representative also proposed amending claim 1 to claim a leak detection port, Examiner indicated that such an amendment will require further consideration as to patentability and whether restriction would be appropriate.